

*Antonio Campati*

**The Tension between Competence and Democratic Representation:  
The «Immediacy» Issue in Dealing with Covid-19**

Covid-19 has brought attention to the opposition between representation and knowledge, which now seemed neutralized by the «ideology of immediacy», that considers the presence of mediators completely superfluous. The aim of this paper is therefore to bring attention back to the constitutive foundations of representative democracy to highlight how the need to respond immediately to the popular will is inherent in its original structure. To proceed in this direction, we will focus on the concept of «immediate democracy» proposed by Pierre Rosanvallon especially in two of his works: *La légitimité démocratique. Impartialité, réflexivité, proximité* (2008) and in the recent *Le siècle du populisme. Histoire, théorie, critique* (2020). This analysis demonstrates how what appeared unprecedented in the management of Covid-19 is a completely understandable procedure for a representative democracy if we are aware of the developments that have defined its conformation over the last few centuries.

*James Cartlidge*

**Anxiety and Boredom in the Covid-19 Crisis: A Heideggerian Analysis**

Martin Heidegger gave a penetrating account of the different varieties of the moods of anxiety and boredom, which have no doubt been prevalent in the human experience of the Covid-19 pandemic. Heidegger theorized a particular type of anxiety and boredom as what I call 'revelatory moods', intense affective experiences that involve an encounter with our existence as such,

our world, freedom and responsibility for the creation and proliferation of significance. Revelatory moods contain much emancipatory potential, acting as existential catalysts for our being able to authentically seize hold of our lives and possibilities as free agents. For Heidegger, the experiences of anxiety and boredom as ones that put us into contact with the structure of our world and the stunning scope of our freedom, letting us know what we can do and are capable of. But can the same be said of these experiences as they occur in a time when our freedom has been dramatically reduced? I claim that Heidegger's theory can be productively built on, arguing that the anxiety and boredom of the pandemic puts us into contact not with the scope of our freedom, but its reduced limits. But it is the experience of encountering these limits that makes it possible for us to begin to work out how to live in spite of them, forging new modes of solidarity and its enactment. Living authentically in this new situation in spite of our reduced freedom must take place on a prior disclosure of the limits of this freedom. Heidegger locates the possibility of such a disclosure in revelatory anxiety and boredom.

*Matilde Ceron, Carlo Maria Palermo, Giovanni Salpietro*

### **Limits and Outlook of the Covid-19 Pandemic Response in the EU**

European institutions are not well equipped to manage crises. The analysis considers the case of the pandemic response highlighting the limits of the current governance framework and the sparse scope for EU level action in the health and economic domain. In parallel, the comparative analysis the case studies of national responses in four key member states (France, Germany, Italy and Spain) evidences their divergences in timing and scope, their sub-optimality in comparison to joint action and the risk for increasing the distance between core and periphery. Building on the findings and the policy debate surrounding proposed crisis-response instruments, as well as enacted measures at European level, the analysis highlights how the temporary palliative of ECB action and Next Generation EU do not tackle the underlying asymmetries in the governance framework. The Covid-19 driven policy developments and negotiations are evaluated against lesson from the Euro crisis in deriving insights on the extent to which a breakthrough has taken place and what is required for a deviation from minimal temporary compromise measure to a permanent solution to EMU shortcomings and incompleteness. A dramatic exogenous pandemic has opened an unprecedented window of opportunity for transnational solidarity within the EU. However, the divi-

siveness of the debate may further strengthen in the aftermath of a symmetric crisis with an asymmetric impact disproportionately penalising weaker economies and its legacy of skyrocketing public debt. While at the time of the analysis the full development of the crisis response is still unfolding, we confirm the need for furthering integration with a fully-fledged federal budget, of high value in view of the upcoming Conference on the Future of Europe and related debate on institutional reforms.

*Francesca Cerutti*

**Litmus Papers: Health Security and the Limits of International Cooperation during Covid-19**

It has been almost one year that international leaders and communities have struggled with the most treacherous enemy. Started as a local outbreak and rapidly escalated to a global health challenge, the pandemic has eventually transformed into a political tragedy. Because viruses know no borders and states are only as safe as the more fragile in the system are, the problem posed by deadly infectious diseases is typically considered more favorable to international regimes' formation and effectiveness than other issues. Against the odds, during the last few months, the world has witnessed divided reactions, nationalism, and protectionist tendencies; the parachute of international cooperation has yet to spread its wings. Much of the criticism has been directed toward the World Health Organization as the "orchestrator" of the international regime aimed at responding to pandemic outbreaks. In order to make sense of this pattern, the present essay starts by challenging the assumption according to which Global Health and epidemics control are "benign" issue-areas of confrontation, especially after the securitization process that has involved specific infective diseases since the end of the '90s. It continues by exploring the primary legal tool that the regime can deploy against epidemics, namely the International Health Regulations, and asks whether its structure and design fit the (expanded) scope it acquired after 2005. Ultimately the article examines the major concerns raised against WHO's decisions and the narratives of the ongoing de-legitimation process. Preliminary results point toward a complex array of reasons, which altogether contribute to a better understanding of the Organization's mishandling of the crisis and explain its performance's dismal picture. Among those, however, a significant lack of international political awareness seems to be the most troublesome.

*Francesco Gaudiosi, Annachiara Rotondo*

**Universal Health Coverage in the Solidaristic Approach of the Agenda 2030 and the Resurgence of National Personalisms in the Contrast of Covid-19**

The international health emergency related to the spread of Sars-CoV-2 virus has deeply affected the community of states, unprepared to face such a complex and multidimensional phenomenon. Covid-19 had the role of relaunching the critical issue of the complex relationship between economy, society and environment addressed – inter alia – by the Agenda 2030. The latter includes among the other Sustainable Development Goals also the Universal Health Coverage (UHC), deserving a specific reflection in time of pandemic. Covid-19 has indeed disclosed an extreme fragmentation of the contemporary international community together with the existence of new personalisms and a progressive erosion regarding the principle of solidarity, which strongly impede the full achievement of the UHC objective. In this context, international cooperation on the ground of access to medical services and essential healthcare seems to have become a utopia. Hence, this paper suggests the reinforcement of the mechanisms of conditionality as political coercion tools aimed at enforcing the achievement of the SDGs.

*Noemi Magnani*

**The ‘Great Equalizer’? Autonomy, Vulnerability and Solidarity in Uncertain Times**

In this paper I engage with the notion that Covid-19 can be seen as the ‘great equalizer’, in virtue of the widespread sense of uncertainty it has caused and the fact that it has forced us to recognize our shared human fragility. Against the view that Covid-19 is the ‘great equalizer’, I argue that, on the contrary, the pandemic reflects existing vulnerabilities and, in many cases, exacerbates them. I do so by offering first a definition of both ontological and relational vulnerability and discussing some important ethical and political dimensions of vulnerability in conditions of uncertainty. I then claim that understanding vulnerability in both ontological and relational terms allows us to see the differential impact of the pandemic on differently situated individuals. More specifically, I argue that vulnerability in conditions of uncertainty can threaten individuals’ sense of self, and thus their autonomy – both understood in relational terms. I consider what kind of response human vulnerability in times of crisis calls for. In particular, I maintain that a promising way to counteract uncertainty would be to adopt a solidaristic approach to public

health, based on an understanding of solidarity as a relational concept. In other words, I argue that it is through solidarity that individuals' vulnerabilities can be mitigated, and their autonomy promoted, even during the most uncertain times. I finally discuss two objections that could be raised against the solidaristic approach defended in my paper. First, the approach may fail to find the support of individuals who are unwilling to care for others when their own interests are under threat. Second, there might be those who deny that the virus constitutes a serious enough threat to warrant or justify the restrictions on individual freedoms imposed by governments in the name of solidarity. I conclude by arguing that while a commitment to solidarity can be easily undermined by scepticism towards political and other authorities, and by the failures of those authorities themselves, it is paramount that societies strive for it as the best means to preserve individuals' health, autonomy, and well-being.

*Catherine Nolan*

### **Augustine and the Pursuit of Knowledge during a Crisis**

Today we find ourselves in a world where the internet has made information more accessible than ever. This can become overwhelming during a pandemic or other major crisis, when policies must be implemented which compromise some of our interests in order to diminish the effects of the crisis; most people are asked to sacrifice some things they value. Because new policies will affect us in major ways and because we can research the crisis at hand, we may feel a moral obligation to do exactly this. Following the news may seem imperative; having well-informed opinions about every new problem, especially in matters that affect so many people, may seem to be a social duty. However, this sense of obligation is mistaken: most people are not morally obligated to attempt to solve the dilemmas produced by major crises. In the writings of the medieval philosopher Augustine of Hippo, we can find an argument that engaging in such intensive research is even morally wrong for some of us, since it distracts us from other, more important relationships. Freeing ourselves from this false sense of moral obligation means freeing ourselves from the overwhelming reports of tragedies which we are powerless to prevent, the exhausting barrage of fake news, and the never-ending burden of attempting to convince our acquaintances of our scientific, political, and moral claims. We ought to focus instead on acting in loving ways towards those who are close to us.

*Roberta Sala, Virginia Sanchini*

**Mapping Policy Containment Measures to Sars-CoV-2 Pandemic:  
At what Conditions Paternalism is Justified**

The health emergency originated by the Sars-CoV-2 pandemic has led governments to make decisions aimed at containing the spread of the virus. Insofar as considered, even at different degrees, paternalistic, political governmental decisions in response to the Sars-CoV-2 pandemic have raised harsh disagreement within liberal-democratic societies. In particular, the recall to paternalism has occurred with respect to policies that has been considered as infringing individual personal liberties, thus illegitimate.

Drawing from what above, this paper aims to analyse some containment policies and to discuss them in relation to the philosophical debate regarding political or even legal paternalism. In particular, by adopting Gerald Dworkin taxonomy, we will define these policies in relation to four main types of paternalism – namely: hard or weak, strong or soft.

Despite most of the countries are now facing a second wave of the Sars-CoV-2 pandemic, we will mostly focus on the main contested restrictions on personal freedom, namely those highly affecting personal liberty. We will then explore the connection between the consideration of such policies as paternalistic and the subsequent consideration of the same ones as illegitimate: is it a necessary condition that a paternalistic policy is per se and at any condition illegitimate? With respect to this question, we will argue that a sort of ‘impure paternalism’ (which calls for the imposition of proportionate means to achieve individual and collective desirable ends) can be considered acceptable insofar as the following five conditions are all simultaneously respected: i) urgency; ii) epistemic uncertainty; iii) proportionality; iv) provisionality; v) compensation measures.

*Gloria Zuccarelli*

**Illegal Immigration and Refugeehood at the Time of Covid-19:  
Rethinking Amnesties and Closed Borders**

Regardless of very few examples, immigration during Covid-19 emergency has been put on the margins of public discourse. This paper is meant to address immigration and refugeehood to and in the European Union at the time of this health emergency by advancing two theses. The paper defends these two theses relying on two main arguments: one based on morality and a public interest-based one. The first thesis defends the idea of a long-term regularization of all irregular immigrants already residing in the European territory through

the tools of sanatoria and amnesties. Morally, irregular immigrants, as an extreme vulnerable group, have the right to be protected from the epidemic and the exploitation that may follow. The public interest-based argument supports the idea according to which regularizing all the irregular immigrants through amnesties is necessary to benefit and protect the whole European community, by facilitating the tracking of the contagion. Successively this article maintains a policy of closed borders until the state of emergency is declared over. More precisely, it argues that EU Member States, due to the pandemic, are justified and even morally required to exclude would-be immigrants, and even to suspend new asylum applications for potential would-be refugees illegally entering EU Member States. There are four premises behind this non-ideal approach: a) during emergencies, states can take urgent and coercive decisions. b) The Covid-19 pandemic constitutes an emergency that allows states to take coercive actions even with reduced democratic representation. c) The necessity for a European united plan is also sustained. d) Refugees and illegal immigrants are partly considered part of the same arguments even though the normative difference between the two groups is recognized.

